

### REMARKS

Applicant has considered the Office Action mailed on April 18, 2003, and the references cited therewith. No claims are canceled, amended, or added herein; therefore, claims 30-56 remain pending in the Application.

Claims 30-38 and 41-47 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kazama (U.S. 6,174,172) in view of Gates et al. (U.S. 6,524,115). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The primary reference to Kazama teaches a number of embodiments of a mounting socket having multiple spring terminals in vias through a body. Some of the embodiments secure the springs to the vias with solder (e.g., col. 5 lines 60-61), some by a larger spring diameter (col. 6:51-56), and some apparently do not secure the springs at all (e.g., Figs. 1-4). Nowhere does Kazama suggest "a conductive polymer in contact with the spring and with the one via," as recited in independent apparatus claims 30 and 42.

Accordingly, these claims define over Kazama in a patentable manner. The secondary patent to Gates appears to have an earliest effective date of August 20, 1999. The filing date of the present Application, December 21, 1998, antedates this by eight months. Therefore it would seem that Gates is not prior art against the Application, and the rejections must fall. If the Examiner disagrees with this position, Applicant respectfully requests an explanation as to how Gates might constitute a valid reference.

Dependent claims 31-38 and 43-47 include all the features of their parent claims 30 and 42, and thus also define over the validly cited prior art.

Dependent claims 39-40 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kazama in view of Gates et al., and further in view of Stopperan (U.S. 5,719,749). However, Stopperan cannot make up the deficiencies of Kazama, and Gates appears not to be a valid reference against the Application. Thus these rejections also must fall.

Although the summary of the Office Action lists method claims 48-56 as rejected, the Action adduces no statutory grounds for their rejection. Applicant therefore treats them as allowable.

## AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Serial Number: 09/217401

Filing Date: December 21, 1998

Title: EASY MOUNT SOCKET

Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 7

Dkt: 884.088US1 (INTEL)

Conclusion

For the above reasons, Applicant urges that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests reexamination under 35 USC 132 and notification to that effect. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6971 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

KENZO ISHIDA ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Schwegman Lundberg Woessner & Kluth, P.A.  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
612-373-6971

Date 16 July 2003

By

J. Michael Anglin

J. Michael Anglin

Reg. No. 24,916

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 16 day of July, 2003.

KACIA LEE

Name

Kacia Lee

Signature